

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_96343
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in sellers at two main Goma markets in the eastern Democratic Republic of Congo.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1- Yes, the manuscript is important to the scientific community as it adds a new insight and facts about COVID-19 prevalence in authors' country of study. 2- Yes, the title of manuscript looks suitable. 3- The abstract is well-written. 4- The manuscript is well sectioned. However, authors are advised to change "Findings" section into "Results" section. Also, authors are encouraged to add conclusion section. 5- Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct in terms of methodology and results analysis. However, authors should note that whenever P value is more than 0.05 then the two groups under study are not different statistically. And so, authors can't assume that sellers in one market are younger than those in another market when P-value is 0.06. 6- The references look sufficient but authors are advised to give a reference to the survey study done by Irengue et al. in the discussion section. 7- In the methodology, authors are advised to add exclusion criteria like vaccination status. 8- Discussion section should be concise and shorter. 9- In Table 1, authors should add frequency with each percentage for categorical data.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of English language for this manuscript is good.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hasanain Abdulhameed Odhar
Department, University & Country	Al-Zahrawi University College, Iraq